

LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

REMARKS

Initially, applicants would like to express their appreciation to Examiner Erika A. Gary for the courtesies extended to attorney James Milton during a telephone interview on May 11, 2006. The telephone interview involved a discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, and 26. Although agreement was not reached on whether applicants' claims overcome the cited reference, Examiner Gary did agree to reconsider the claims.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-26 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Number 6,560,456 issued to Lohtia et al. on May 6, 2003 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,351,647 issued to Gustafsson on February 26, 2002.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"registering the mobile station with the weather alert notification component upon receipt of the SMS request from the mobile station;
determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period;"

As stated in the previous amendment, the SMS request from the mobile station is an initial registration request to receive a weather alert notification.

As stated in the Office Action, the Examiner agrees that Lohtia does not teach "registering the mobile station with the weather alert notification component upon receipt of the SMS request from the mobile station". Moreover, applicants note that Lohtia does not teach "determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period" either. This is because Lohtia teaches "A called party or destination number corresponding to "800 WEATHER" in this example may indicate that the user is requesting weather information, such as forecasts or observations for either a current location or a preselected location indicated

LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

in the user's service information profile", as stated in column 5, lines 27-32. Furthermore, Lothia determines the current location of the mobile station after gathering and formatting the requested data, as stated in column 6, lines 66-67 through column 7, lines 1-15.

By contrast, applicants' claim 1 a) determines a location of the mobile station and b) teaches the trigger, i.e., "upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period", that causes the location of the mobile station to be determined. Thus, Lothia is missing the element "upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period", as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Second, Gustafsson discloses that a mobile subscriber may order a service announcement with a mobile station by forming a short message dependent on location information, by transmitting the short message with the attached location information to the service provider, as stated in column 6, lines 9-36. The location information is the coordinate information of a base station that serves the mobile station or the geographical center of a cell that the mobile station occupies. In other words, Gustafsson's technique appears to provide location information of the base station and the cell area along with the SMS message request for a service. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Gustafsson does not teach "determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period", as recited in applicants' claim 1. Thus, Gustafsson, similar to Lothia, is missing the element "determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period", as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Lothia with Gustafsson is that a location of the mobile station is not determined upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period.

Therefore the combination of Lothia with Gustafsson does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-11 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

Independent claims 12 and 26 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the combination of Lothia with Gustafsson. For example, claim 12 recites, "wherein the weather alert notification component comprises a locator component that determines a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the weather alert during the time period", and claim 26 recites, "wherein the weather alert notification component comprises a locator component that determines a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period". The combination of Lothia with Gustafsson does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 12 and 26 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.


LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Garrett
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,888

Dated: May 12, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382